

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

Claims 1-8 are pending of which claim 1 have been amended and claims 5-8 has been newly added to more clearly describe the claimed invention. It is believed that no new matter adds by way of amendments made to claims or otherwise to the application. For at least the following reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8 are in proper condition for allowance and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

A-4

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 103

1. The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter APA) in view of Chin et al. (US-5,250,804, hereinafter Chin).

In rejecting the above claims, the Examiner stated that the APA substantially discloses every elements of claim 1 including a control interface card, a CPU of a host computer, an object position data providing triggering signal, a position comparing circuit, a feedback position data, and the like, except for a data buffer for registering of object, fetching object for comparing an object shifting. However, the Examiner relied upon Chin to show a data buffer for registering of object, fetching registered object for comparing and an object shifting. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of APA and Chin because Chin's teaches the Ve signal ... and loads the same into a buffer ... the comparator unit 27 compares the output of the buffer 26 and the count output of the SLC 12 would overcome incompatibilities between the read cycle of the computer and the scanning speed.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and would like to point out that the APA never mentioned a control interface card, and Applicant respectfully submits that the recitation of a control interface card at line 6-7 of page 1 of the specification pointed out by the Examiner is in fact referred to the Field of the Present Invention, and not the description in the APA section. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submit that the interpretation of the Examiner that the APA discloses a control interface card is due to an error.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed amended independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that APA and Chin substantially fail to teach or disclose every features of the claimed invention. More specifically, both APA and Chin substantially fails to teach or disclose an interface card comprising at least "a data buffer adapted for registering a plurality of object position data computed by the CPU of said host computer", as required by the amended claim 1.

Instead, Chin, at lines 50-52 of col. 2, substantially discloses that the handheld scanner has a data buffer for temporarily storing the scan line picture data prior to retrieval by the computer system therefrom. In other words, because Chin substantially teaches that the data buffer is for temporarily storing the scan line picture data that can be later retrieved by the computer system, therefore, it is clear that Chin fails to teach, suggest or hint that the buffer data is adapted for registering the object position data computed by the computer system. Therefore, Chin cannot meet the claimed invention in this regard.

Furthermore, Chin, at lines 55-64, substantially discloses that the lost scan line detecting device comprises a first counter means for counting the photo receiver pulses, a second counter means for counting the step trigger signals, and a comparator means for comparing count outputs of the first and second counter means and for generating a lost scan line signal whenever the count outputs are unequal so as to indicate to the computer system that a lost scan line condition has occurred. In other words, Chin substantially fails to teach, suggest or disclose a position compare circuit adapted for fetching a registered object position data from said data buffer and

comparing the fetched object position data with a feedback position data obtained via an object shifting control means, and then fetching a next registered object position data from said data buffer and comparing the next registered object position data with a feedback position data obtained via the object shifting control means, and a trigger I/O circuit adapted for providing a triggering signal to the CPU of said host computer of the registered position data is determined to match with one of the feedback position data by said position compare circuit as required by the claimed invention as claimed in the proposed amended claim 1. Instead, Chin substantially teaches a lost scan line detecting device for comparing count outputs of the first and second counter means and for generating a lost scan line signal whenever the count outputs are unequal so as to indicate to the computer system that a lost scan line condition has occurred. Accordingly, Chin cannot possibly meet the claimed invention in this regard.

Therefore, the teachings of APA and Chin, either alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or render the claimed invention obvious. Therefore claims 1 and 3 should be allowed.

Furthermore, because the newly added independent claim 5 also recites features that are similar to the proposed claim 1, therefore the newly added proposed claims 5-8 also patently define over the APA and Chin for at least the same reasons set forth above. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, and 3, and 5-8 patently define over APA and Chin, and therefore should be allowed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

2. *The Office Action rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Chin and further in view of Wess et al. (US-6,198,544, hereinafter Wess).*

Applicants respectfully submit that the US patent number 6,198,544 is in fact granted to Potut et al and not to Wess et al. as stated by the Office Action, and that the Potut reference is directed to a Hair Grip. Therefore, the technical field of Potut is from an non-analogous art. Accordingly, claim 2 patently define over APA, Chin and Potut/Wess for at least the same reasons discussed above, and therefore should be allowed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

3. *The Office Action rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Chin and further in view of Johnson et al. (US-5,764,896, hereinafter Johnson).*

Applicant respectfully disagrees and would like to point out that even though the Examiner relied upon Johnson to disclose a bus controller and a bus arbitrator, still Johnson cannot cure the specific deficiencies of APA and Chin for at least the same reasons discussed above. Accordingly, claim 4 also patently define over both APA and Chin. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

A-8

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-8 of the present application are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted



Date: October 13, 2004

Chun Liu

Obligation

ADLINK TECHNOLOGY INC.

Tel: 886 2 8771 8948

Fax: 886-2-8771 9757

E-mail: ycpatent105@hotmail.com